

CLASSICAL WEEKLY

VOL. 36, NO. 5

November 2, 1942

WHOLE NO. 956

COMMENT AND CONJECTURE ON JULIUS CAESAR

Passive Periphrastic Construction in Caesar's Writings (*Kek*); Caesar and the Alexander Legend (*De Witt*); Gaulish Proper Names (*Stand-erwick*); Bridgehead (*Born*); Caesar the Geographer (*Downes*)

REVIEWS

KLEBERG, *Catalogus Codicum Graecorum et Latinorum Bibliothecae Gotoburgensis* (*Sister M. Borromeo*); GRENE, *Three Greek Tragedies in Translation* (*Hadas*); PERSSON, *Religion of Greece in Prehistoric Times* (*Mueller*)

ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES

Ullman and Smalley's new workbook

PROGRESS TESTS IN LATIN

— for —

LATIN FOR AMERICANS

— First Book —

Just published—this superb first-year Latin workbook containing standard type tests covering all the fundamentals of Latin teaching. Based on the original edition of the Ullman-Smalley Progress Tests, these retain all the elements that made the earlier book a standard favorite, and bring enrichments to the tests corresponding to the newer materials of the basal text, *Latin for Americans, First Book*. \$.68

The tests cover: COMPREHENSION : FORMS : VOCABULARY : SYNTAX :
PRONUNCIATION : SENTENCES : WORD STUDY : DERIVATION : CIVILIZATION

(May be used with any of the modern first-year
Latin texts with excellent results)

The Macmillan Company

New York : Boston : Chicago
Dallas : Atlanta : San Francisco

THE LIBRARY OF THE
GENERAL SERIALS
DIVISION
NOV 15 1942

CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Published weekly (each Monday) except in weeks in which there is an academic vacation or Armistice Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas, New Year's Day, Washington's Birthday, Easter, or Memorial Day. A volume contains approximately twenty-five issues.

Owner and Publisher: The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. Place of Publication: University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Printed by The Beaver Printing Company, Greenville, Pennsylvania.

James Stinchcomb, Editor, University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

John F. Gummere, Secretary and Treasurer, William Penn Charter School, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Contributing Editors: Lionel Casson, Jotham Johnson, Eugene W. Miller, Charles T. Murphy, J. C. Plumpe, Bluma L. Trell. Price, \$2.00 per volume in the Western Hemisphere; elsewhere \$2.50. All subscriptions run by the volume. Single numbers: to subscribers 15 cents, to others 25 cents prepaid (otherwise 25 cents and 35 cents). If affidavit to invoice is required, sixty cents must be added to the subscription price.

Entered as second-class matter October 14, 1938, at the post office at Pittsburgh, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in the Act of February 28, 1925, authorized October 14, 1938.

Volume 36 contains issues dated: October 5, 12, 19, 26; November 2, 16, 30; December 7, 14 (1942); January 11, 18, 25; February 8, 15; March 1, 8, 15, 22, 29; April 5, 12; May 10, 17, 24; June 7 (1943).

COMING ATTRACTIONS

NOVEMBER 7 Central High School, Trenton

NEW JERSEY CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

10 A.M. Trends in College Board Testing, Dr. John F. Gummere, Headmaster, William Penn Charter School, Philadelphia; Greek Temples and Shrines, Mrs. Clara Johnson Lodholz, Philadelphia

11 A.M. Panel Discussion on Latin Writing: Professor Shirley Smith, New Jersey College for Women; Dr. Walter Freeman, Upper Montclair Teachers College; Dr. Walter Myers, Camden; Ernest F. White, South Orange

NOVEMBER 8 Saint Louis University

PUBLIC INDUCTIVE LECTURE (EIGHTH SERIES, 1)

Lecturer: Professor William Charles Korfmacher, Saint Louis University

Topic: Graduate Classical Training and Productive Scholarship

NOVEMBER 20 Saint Louis University

CLASSICAL CLUB OF ST. LOUIS

President: Mr. Frederick Horner, U.S.N.

Vice-President Professor William Arndt, Concordia Seminary

Secretary: Miss Evelyn Patterson, Ward Junior High School, University City

Treasurer: Mr. Charles Wetmore, Southwest High School, St. Louis

Committeemen: Professor Chauncey Finch, Saint Louis University; Mrs. Del Martz, Wydown School, Clayton

Speaker: Professor Thomas S. Duncan, Washington University

Subject: Greek Orators, Especially Demosthenes

NOVEMBER 27 John Marshall Hotel, Richmond

CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF VIRGINIA

Papers: Dr. Janet H. Meade, Converse College (The Humanities in Wartime); Professor J. B. Haley, Randolph-Macon College, Ashland (Episcopal Bishops and Other Borrowings); Mrs. W. L. Lynn, Clifton Forge High School (A Classical Background as a Vital Part of Education for Total Victory)

NOVEMBER 28 Hotel New Yorker, New York

CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE ATLANTIC STATES

10:30 A.M. Miss Edna White, Dickinson High School, Jersey City, presiding

Papers: Professor William C. Bagley, Columbia University (Do the Classics Have a Place in Wartime Education?); Professor George Depue Hadzsits, University of Pennsylvania (Report of American Classical League on Classical Studies in War Time); Professor Franklin B. Krauss, Pennsylvania State College (War Aims of the Pennsylvania State Association of Classical Teachers); Professor Ernst Riess, Hunter College (Report of the Committee on the Classics and the War Effort); Professor Karl Lehmann-Hartleben, New York University (The Classics in a Changing World); President George N. Shuster, Hunter College (The War and the World of Classical Thought)

DECEMBER 4 Kansas City Club, Kansas City

MISSOURI TEACHERS ASSOCIATION,

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS

Chairman: Professor Arthur F. Hoogstraet, St. Stanislaus Seminary

Vice-Chairman: Miss Daphne Crawford, Herculaneum High School

Secretary: Miss Annis L. Elliott, Northeast Junior High School, Kansas City

Luncheon Speakers: Rev. William H. McCabe, President of Rockhurst College; Mr. H. J. Haskell, Editor, The Kansas City Star

2 P.M. Papers: Professor Jonah W. D. Skiles, Westminster College (Teaching the Reading of Latin in the Latin Word Order); Professor Norman J. DeWitt, Washington University (Latin in War Time)

DECEMBER 28-29 Hotel Sinton, Cincinnati

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

COMMENT AND CONJECTURE ON JULIUS CAESAR

The Passive Periphrastic Construction in Caesar's Writings

Before the time of Caesar the passive periphrastic construction of verbs was infrequent in comparison with *debere*, *oportere* and other verbs expressing obligation, propriety, and necessity. In the writings of Cicero, Caesar's contemporary, the total number of occurrences of these other verbs is about the same as the number of occurrences of the usage called 'passive periphrastic.' In the extant works of Caesar there are twice as many passive periphrastic constructions as occurrences of all these other verbs. In fact, the proportionate frequency of the passive periphrastic construction is higher in Caesar's writings than in those of any other writer of the Republican period of Latin literature.

Caesar's uses of this construction may be classified in a few categories with easily definable meanings.

In some fifteen instances a gerundive used attributively with the verb *videri* expresses that something does or does not seem 'capable' or 'worthy' of being 'borne' or 'admired' or 'done' or that something seems simply 'to be done' (e.g., B. C. 3.51.3, 3.110.1; B. G. 1.33.5, 5.44.14, 6.25.5, 6.42.3). The passive periphrastic constructions in B. G. 5.8.4, 5.29.7, 5.33.4 and 7.14.2 have no more strongly injunctive force than these gerundives.

In direct statement about thirty passive periphrastic expressions signify that something 'must' take place, as colloquial English uses 'have to' in expressing necessity (e.g., B. C. 1.29.2, 1.65.5, 3.30.4; B. G. 1.32.5, 1.48.7, 2.5.2, 4.24.2). The degree or kind of compulsion varies with the meaning of the verb and the circumstances in which it appears.

Two-thirds of all the passive periphrastic constructions occur in indirect statement, where Caesar reports what he or someone else thinks, or holds as an opinion, or has decided (existimare, putare, arbitrari, censere, iudicare, statuere, constituere), or says or knows (loqui, scire, intellegere) is the proper or necessary course of action (e.g., B. G. 1.7.4, 1.23.1, 2.2.5, 4.5.1, 5.46.4, 7.36.1). Most of the 125 examples represent a procedure as that which in the opinion of the party concerned 'has' or 'is' to be carried out in the particular circumstances. Caesar reports what he or others recognize as the most desirable or necessary procedure. Because it is represented as needed or capable or worthy of being carried out, there is therefore some implicit compulsion to act in the manner designated, but the person whose opinion is presented is not attempting to persuade others to his way of thinking.

The passive periphrastic is not a substitute for *debere* or *oportere*, verbs which Caesar uses comparatively infrequently and with their own characteristic meanings. *Debere* represents an action or condition as 'due' to

take place or exist, or as the 'duty' of someone to perform or bring about, since certain conditions prevail, or out of regard for position or merit or like considerations (e.g., B. G. 1.11.3, 7.19.5; B. C. 1.8.3). *Oportere* expresses not only the speaker's view of proper or just, and therefore implicitly obligatory, conduct, but also implies an attempt to persuade others to believe likewise (e.g., B. G. 1.34.2, 1.36.2, 1.44.8, 3.24.5, 7.66.7). In B. G. 3.18.5 the Gauls cry out that "the opportunity to accomplish the undertaking successfully is not to be lost, that they ought to march upon the camp." In the first clause *amittendam non esse* signifies merely that the chance is too good to lose, while in *iri oportere* the Gauls are trying to persuade their leaders and one another to attack the camp.

B. C. 3.10.8-9 exemplifies the distinction between *debere*, and *oportere*. *Debere* signifies that it is 'due' that terms of peace be sought at Rome from the senate and the people (since they had not been able to come to an agreement before). By *oportere* Caesar tries to persuade Pompey that meanwhile it should please the state and themselves if each should pledge that he will disband his army within the next three days.

Injunctive force derived from law or military regulations is also expressed by *oportere* (e.g., B. G. 1.4.1, 1.16.5). Caesar does not employ the passive periphrastic construction to represent such compulsion.

In B. G. 2.20.1 this construction simply states as fact that all tasks Caesari erant agenda uno tempore, while quod erat insigne cum ad arma concurrere oporteret implies generally recognized compulsion of army regulations that the soldiers assemble for battle when the flag was raised.

These observations suggest that the passive periphrastic has no inherently strong injunctive force, that Caesar's liberal use of it is much like the English practice of saying that this or that 'is' or 'has' to be done as a matter-of-fact statement of opinion of one's obligation with no special intent to influence others, that the significance of the passive periphrastic may usually be distinguished from that of *debere* and *oportere*, and that Caesar finds it a particularly apt mode of expressing in indirect statement one's conception of obligatory or necessary procedure.

ANNA DALE KEK

INDIANA CENTRAL COLLEGE

Caesar and the Alexander Legend

The latest volume of REA (42) to reach these shores contains an article by J. Gagé, "Hercule-Melqart, Alexandre, et les Romains à Gadès" (425-38), which shows how the shrine of Hercules at Gades became a symbol of the Alexander legend, a point of departure for world

conquest. The process, according to Gagé, involved a polarity often found in ancient thought. Alexander had reached, or nearly reached, the eastern limit of the Oicumene; Hercules had reached the western limit; the opposites were mutually suggestive if not identical. By 68 B.C. there was a statue of Alexander in the shrine of Hercules.

The symbolism of the Hercules shrine, we may add, was defined by Hannibal when he began his march against Italy with a vow to the hero at Gades. The associations thus invoked were strengthened when Hannibal followed the traditional itinerary of Hercules across the Pyrenees, southern Gaul, and the Alps. The influence of the conquering-hero legend upon ambitious Romans needs no elaboration here. Pompey the Great reenacted the Hercules-Alexander rôle with a certain lack of imagination. In addition to acquiring the cognomen Magnus, he made a point of crossing the Alps, southern Gaul, the Pyrenees, and Spain to Gades, thus reversing the itinerary of Hercules and Hannibal.

What of Caesar? Our three prime sources (Suetonius, Caesar 7; Dio Cassius 37.52.3; Plutarch, Caesar 11.3) agree that Caesar was profoundly moved at Gades when he recognized the disparity between his own accomplishments and those of Alexander. It is my intention to appraise the significance of the Gades incident.

First of all, the Alexandrian scope of Caesar's career as a conqueror must be recognized. The conquest of Gaul was an imperial design, Alexandrian in concept and execution. The Gauls were hereditary enemies of Rome just as the Persians had been enemies of Greece; the campaigns in both instances were a matter of national revenge. Alexander had been the first Greek leader to cross the Danube (Arrian, *Anabasis* 1.3-4); Caesar matched this by crossing the Rhine. A similar polarity may be seen in the fact that Alexander had gone to the extreme southeast in India while Caesar went to the extreme northwest in Britain. Parenthetically we may note that the expeditions to Britain were hardly justifiable from the standpoint of strategy; Augustus, who was seldom given to romantic thoughts, found it more profitable to collect the customs duties on British trade than to conquer the isle (Strabo 4.5.3). The polarity to which I refer appears to have been noticed by Catullus: in *Carmen* 11 he suggests the identity of opposites when he mentions the East and India (Alexander's conquests) and the Alps, the Rhine, the Channel, and the British (Caesar's conquests). But, to resume, we may also note that Caesar's last plan, according to Plutarch's source (58.3), was to make a grand expedition into the Parthian country, over the Caucasus into Scythia, and thence across central Europe to the Rhine and Gaul. (A certain modern general staff, manifestly thinking in Alexandrian terms,

appears to be slightly behind schedule in its attempt to reverse this itinerary.)

The extraordinary gallantry with which Alexander and Caesar often regarded their enemies who had been honorably defeated is also a matter of record. In both cases clementia appears to have been a matter of considered policy. Moreover, Caesar was the first Roman, as Alexander had been the first Greek, to envision a community of imperial dimensions based upon a citizenship far wider than that of the city-state. In recognizing the strength that Gaul might bring to the Roman community, Caesar turned the face of Graeco-Roman civilization toward continental western Europe and the future; here his accomplishment was perhaps greater than that of Alexander, for it was toward the past and not the future that civilization turned in the conquest of the East.

One final point: since Mommsen's time Caesar's Commentaries on the Gallic War have been regarded as political propaganda designed to influence contemporary public opinion. This view, as I hope to show elsewhere, is too simple and at the same time too sophisticated. For one thing, Caesar's contemporaries Cicero (Brutus 262) and Hirtius (B. G. 8.1.5), who presumably knew the facts, regarded Caesar's writings as source material for future historians, i.e. exactly what they were supposed to be according to the rigidly defined genre of the commentarii. Considerable other evidence may be adduced to show that Caesar was thinking more of "gloria" in the Ciceronian sense than of a contemporary audience. It is important to note that the genre of the commentarii is in a direct line of descent from such writings as the *Hypomnemata* of Ptolemy, a primary source for the record of Alexander's campaigns. In other words, in providing an official version of his accomplishments for posterity, Caesar adopted a literary form that was closely associated with Alexander.

In these conjectures there is no implication that Caesar was a sedulous imitator of Alexander. The Alexander legend seems to have given direction to Caesar's ambitions and to have exerted what the psychologists call a "trigger-action." But it was not the boisterous cavalryman of the popular legend whose career gave direction to Caesar's achievement, but a greater Alexander whose deeper counsels the Roman was himself great enough to emulate—the Alexander whose character W. W. Tarn and C. A. Robinson, Jr., have been redefining in the past decade.

The "trigger-action" effect of the Alexander legend, if our conjecture is correct, may very well have taken place at Gades in the environment which symbolized for the Roman mind the tradition of world conquest and great achievement. Under these powerful suggestive influences Caesar suddenly recognized his own future, and was understandably moved. The Big Idea came to him. How he translated the Alexander legend

into terms of the Roman tradition, the political environment of the times, and his own genius, is part of the record of world history.

NORMAN J. DEWITT

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Gaulish Proper Names

In reading Caesar a student comes upon a great number of Gaulish proper names. Frequently a teacher is asked their meaning by the word-curious.

Gaulish is a Celtic language of the group to which belong Irish, Welsh and the tongue of the ancient Britons. It has survived primarily in proper names (of tribes, towns, persons, rivers, etc.) but where there is no surviving common name—and there are not many—often comparison with a kindred language, such as Irish, gives a clue to the meaning of a Gaulish proper name.

The proper names Caturiges 'battle-kings', Dumnorix 'king of the world', Orgetorix 'king of killers', Vercingetorix 'super-king of warriors' have a common second element, *rix* (plural *riges*). This is the Gaulish *rix* 'king' found only in proper names, yet cognate to Latin *rex* and Irish *re* (genitive *rig*). In Caturiges, *catu* 'battle' is a noun stem (*u*-stem noun) cognate to Irish *cath* 'battle'. In Dumnorix, *dumno* 'world' is a noun stem (*o*-stem noun) cognate to Irish *domun* 'world'. Of Orgetorix, *orgeto* 'killer' is a noun stem made from the verb *org-e* (imperative) 'kill' cognate to Irish *org-im* 'I kill'. Of Vercingetorix, *ver-* 'above' is a prefix, and *cingeto* 'killer' is a noun stem cognate to Irish *cing* (genitive *cinged*) 'warrior'.

The Gaulish word *broga* 'land, country' is found in proper names both as an *a*-stem and as an *i*-stem (*-brogi-*). The first element of Allobroges (also Allobrogae) 'people of another land' is the adjective stem *allo-* 'other' (Latin *alius*, Greek *ἄλλος* 'other', English *all*). *Nitio-* of Nitiobriges 'people of a fighting land' is a stem cognate to Irish *nith* 'fight, battle'.

Aedui (written also Haedui) is the well-known tribal name of a Gaulish people long friendly to the Romans. Without doubt the base of this word is *aed* 'fire' (cognates are Irish *aed* 'fire', Latin *aedis* 'fireplace, building, temple', Old English *ad* 'funeral pyre'); *-ui* is of the adjective suffixal stem *-uo-*. Therefore Aedui could mean 'the fiery people' with reference to their temperament, or the people in some way especially connected with fire. The Celtic is almost devoid of *b*'s. The initial in Haedui is probably a 'cockney' *b* inserted by the Romans; cf. *harena* for *arena*, etc.

The second element of Noviodunum 'new town' and of Verodunum 'town or hill of men' (Verdun) is the Gaulish word *dunum* 'enclosure, fortified place, town, hill'. 'Hill' is probably a derived meaning from the fact that enclosures or fortified places were frequently located on hills. (Cf. English cognate *town* from Old

English *tun* 'enclosure, town'.) *Novio-* 'new' of Noviodunum is an adjective stem cognate to Latin *novus*; *vero-* 'man' is a noun stem cognate to Latin *vir*.

Ambiani means 'people of the river' from the Gaulish word *ambe* 'river' plus the adjective suffixal stem *-ano-* substantivized; Morini 'people of the sea' comes from the Gaulish word *more* 'sea' cognate to Latin *mare*. The name is built like the Latin *marinus*.

Galba evidently means 'the corpulent'; Gobanitio 'the little blacksmith' is a diminutive, cognate to Irish *goba* (genitive *gobann*) 'blacksmith'; Cavarillus 'the little giant' is also a diminutive, cognate to Irish *caur* 'giant'.

Caletes 'the strong men' is a form of the Gaulish *calet* 'strong, tough, hardy'; Nemetes 'the sanctuary-men' includes the stem *nemet-* which is cognate to Irish *nemed* 'sanctuary' and Latin *nemus* 'sacred grove'; Senones 'old men or ancient people' has the stem *seno-* which is cognate to Latin *senex* 'old'.

Nantuates means 'the valley-men': *nantu-* (weakened from *nanto-*) is the stem of the Gaulish *nanto* 'valley'; Atrebatas 'possessors of dwellings, dwellers' shows a base *treb-* cognate to Irish *a-treb-a* 'dwells', Welsh *treb* 'dwelling', Latin *trabs* 'timber, beam', English *thorp*. The suffix *-ates* (singular *-as*) of these two words is similar to the Latin adjective suffix *-as* (genitive *-atis*) as in *arpinas*, *infinas*, *curas*.

Matrona, the Gaulish term for the river Marne, obviously means 'mother'. Three variants are found in the plural: *matrae*, *matres*, and *matronae*; the Latin cognates *mater* and *matrona* are evident.

Bibrax (also Bibracte), the name of a town made famous by Caesar, is probably associated with the Gaulish *beber* 'beaver' (Latin cognate *fiber*) and means 'beaver-place, beaver-town'.

H. F. STANDERWICK

TOWNSEND HARRIS HIGH SCHOOL, NEW YORK

The Bridgehead

"Owing to the restrictions which they impose upon movement and maneuver, wide and unfordable rivers exercise considerable influence on military operations. They constitute obstacles to an attack and natural lines of resistance for defensive and delaying action. They assist in screening against hostile ground reconnaissance and in providing security against hostile mechanized attack."

The passage quoted (Field Service Regulations: Operations [FM 100-5] Government Printing Office, Washington 1941, Par. 809) is the introductory statement to the latest official view on the ever difficult job of getting an army across a water barrier in the presence of the enemy, and the equally important job of preventing the opposing force from crossing to the friendly side. The campaigns of antiquity which involved the solution of these problems are not few, and

the recorded stories about them abound in literature. A detailed study of this particular operation, the bridgehead, would certainly not be without interest. Here, however, I have space for only a few observations. Relieved of all responsibility for completeness, I have limited the selection of illustrative material to the text of Caesar.¹

Whether the crossing must be made in an advance or in a retreat, the principle of providing protection for the main force is the same. On one occasion Pompey sent out his cavalry to harass Caesar who was withdrawing his main body. They established contact only when the river Genusus with its difficult banks held up Caesar. According to Caesar's account (B.C. 3.75-6), "he opposed them with his own cavalry supported by four hundred skirmishers." This combined force repelled the Pompeians and "withdrew unharmed to the main body" which crossed over the river without further difficulty.

Not only is adequate protection necessary, but common sense—as well as the rule book—dictates that trains (baggage, supplies, etc.) should be got over ahead of the main body in a retreat.² Both rules were violated by the Helvetians who "encumbered by baggage and not expecting him" were cut up badly by Caesar as they tried to cross the Saône by means of a ponton bridge and by rafts (B.C. 1.12). As if this were not enough, that part (three fourths) of the Helvetian army which had safely crossed before Caesar caught up with them failed to dispose its forces in such a way as to prevent Caesar from constructing a bridge and crossing over after them!³

"Too little and too late" was poor consolation to Domitius whose five cohorts (battalions) sent from Corfinium to cut the bridge over the river which separated them from Caesar were driven back by Caesar's advance guard (strength unknown) while the bridge was still intact.⁴

The book says, "When the enemy is already in possession of a river line which cannot be turned, the crossing must be forced. . . . If the bridges have been destroyed the covering forces are put across in motor boats. At the same time bridges are constructed rapidly under hostile fire. . . . In an operation involving the

crossing of a river, the actual crossing is a means, not the end sought. . . . In establishing a bridgehead for a large force there are usually three successive objectives of the enemy on the river: first, a position which will eliminate effective, direct, small-arms fire from the crossing front; second, a position which will eliminate ground observed artillery fire from the selected ponton bridge site(s). . . ."⁵

Caesar found himself on the unpleasant end of this situation at Ilerda. "Caesar tried to repair the bridges, but the size of the river did not allow it nor [hardly a second point!] did the cohorts (battalions) of the opposing forces disposed on the bank allow it. It was easy for them to prevent it both because of the nature and size of the river and [again a secondary reason!] because the fire was being concentrated from all along the bank upon one narrow spot." He adds feelingly that "it was difficult to do the job in a rapidly flowing river and, at the same time, to avoid the enemy fire" (B.C. 1.50).

Whatever the situation which occurred, the story as Caesar tells it shows what even an excellent general is up against when he is blocked by a large river held by the enemy. In fact, after the insertion of three chapters (red herrings?), Caesar quietly continues (B.C. 1.54).

Since Caesar was in such a tight spot—the roads were held by enemy infantry and cavalry, and the bridges could not be constructed—Caesar ordered his soldiers to build boats. . . . When these were finished he hauled them by wagon at night some twenty-two miles from the camp and in them ferried his men across the river. Unobserved, he occupied a hill adjoining the far bank and quickly fortified it before the enemy discovered his actions. To this place he next brought over a full legion, and from both sides started building the bridge which he completed in two days.

The modern general confronted with the same problem also knows that "the defenses of a river line can sometimes be outflanked. . . . An attempt is made to deceive the enemy as to the projected point of crossing, while a strong mobile force makes an unopposed crossing elsewhere. . . . The location of engineer matériel prior to the crossing (particularly ponton bridge equipment) must be carefully concealed."⁶

An example of failure to press hard upon an enemy who has a river at his back is afforded by Domitius who allowed Scipio to cross the Aliacmon and to occupy the heights dominating the farther bank.⁷ What happened when a Gallic leader attempted to prevent Caesar's use of a bridge over the Aisne illustrates the disastrous result of incomplete action. The Gauls crossed the river by a ford above the bridge and hoped to get

¹Some good passages are B.G. 1.8, 12, 13; 2.9, 10, 19-27; 4.4, 18; 7.58-62; 8.18, 19, 27, 36; B.C. 1.16, 40, 49, 54, 59-63, 65, 83; 3.37, 75, 88.

²FM 100-5 par. 854: "Trains, motorized equipment, and a part of the artillery cross first."

³Cf. FM 100-5, par. 845: "The river bank positions are held in strength; adequate reserves are provided to intervene at decisive areas. . . . Emplacements are so located that the opposite bank and its approaches are held under fire and the enemy's attempts to cross are frustrated in their beginning."

⁴B.C. 1.16. Cf. FM 100-5, par. 844: "The commander must insure the complete destruction of all bridges and fords, which cross the river within his sector, to prevent them from falling intact into the hands of the enemy."

⁵FM 100-5; par. 814-5.

⁶FM 100-5, par. 812, 822.

⁷B.C. 3.37. Cf. FM 100-5, par. 855: "The river may lie in the rear of a defensive position. This is equivalent to defending a bridgehead. . . . Plans must be made for withdrawal across the river."

between it and Caesar's army. Their plans were discovered,⁸ Caesar crossed the bridge (which they had failed to defend on their own side of the river) and attacked them from the rear.⁹

One of the best examples of the difficulties inherent in engagements on a river line is found in the meeting between Caesar and the Nervii (B.G. 2.19-27). As Caesar approached the river he had his cavalry out in front,¹⁰ his slingers and archers as an advance guard. The main body was six legions freed for action. Then followed his trains, and the rear guard of two legions. The enemy who were concealed in the wooded hills on the far side allowed the cavalry to cross, and the main body to approach and prepare to halt. Then they routed the cavalry screen and attacked the main body, at a disadvantageous time, by crossing the river, charging up the hill and engaging in a general mêlée.

From Caesar's account one can easily see how nearly they came to being successful. "One should not conclude that men of such great courage had rashly dared to cross so large a river, to climb the very high banks, and get up to a spot unfavorable to them, because their high morale had made it easy for them to accomplish a task which was in itself extremely difficult" (B.G. 2.27). What more can the winning general say of the enemy who nearly got him?

As the last illustration I have chosen one which involves the all-important elements of secrecy and surprise. Modern doctrine prescribes that "tactical groupings are assigned to each crossing front and are given instructions regarding time of crossing, objectives, zones of action, assistance to adjacent units, and type and location of bridges to be constructed. Other troops may also be assigned to make feints or demonstrations at points other than the main crossing fronts so as to deceive the defenders and to draw them away from the main crossing fronts."¹¹

This point is very well illustrated in the elaborate plans made by Labienus to get his hard pressed army back across the Seine (B.G. 7.59-62). He created a diversion by sending a good sized force upstream and guaranteed that it would be discovered. He left a fair force in the center. He sent the main body downstream in extreme secrecy. The success of his plan is told very simply. "Because they believed that the Romans were crossing in three separate places . . . the enemy divided

their forces into three parts" (B.G. 7.61). The result was inevitable. The main body of the Roman army crossed with little or no opposition and from the flank attacked in force the scattered troops of the defenders.

LESTER K. BORN

CAPTAIN, UNITED STATES COAST ARTILLERY

Caesar the Geographer

For the student interested in 'mores' Caesar has no equal. One reason for the utility of his sociological comments is that they are always closely integrated with primary considerations of geography. Belligerence, long emphasized in the traditional study of Caesar's Commentaries, is itself seen as a social science when considered alongside the calmer forces of human interest which are just as abundant and as meaningful in the pages of Caesar as in those of a modern textbook on social studies.

The "two important formulae" on which many a historian insists we begin our examination of historical development are listed by T. R. Glover as (i) Ranges, Rivers and Roads, and (ii) Clan, Canton and City. These are the formulae which teachers follow to get young people to appreciate the reasons for many regional differences in our own country. The student of Caesar is entirely ready to follow them when he reads the familiar "*Gallia est omnis divisa in partes tres*."

The rivers of Europe become more than headline names in the daily newspaper when the young student realizes that Caesar long ago wrote for him accurate, first-hand information about their courses and peculiarities: the Marne; the Seine; the Rhine, whose turbulent waters Caesar had to bridge in order to get men across in safety; the Loire, so swollen from snows that it appeared altogether unfordable; the Thames, crossed on foot in one place only and that with great difficulty; the Rhine, which "on its approach to the ocean divides into several streams, forming many large islands . . . then through many mouths flows into the ocean."

Another excellent geography lesson for these times is found in Caesar's description of Britain. Caesar made only a few mistakes in his description and these are bases for excellent lessons in critical understanding. He was wrong in believing that the southern side of Britain faced the coast of Gaul (unless he used 'Gallia' in its broad sense) and likewise in his belief that its western side faced Spain. His statement that in some of the smaller islands of Britain night in winter lasts for thirty days is probably due to a confusion of names and location of islands.

Though some of his commentators insist that Caesar added chapters 11-28 to his sixth book to cover up the very insignificant achievements of his invasion of Britain, from the point of human interest these sections are among the richest chapters of the Commentaries.

⁸Cf. FM 100-5, par. 818: "Tactically, the attacker seeks concealment for his movement to the river, concealed final assembly areas," etc.

⁹B. G. 2.9-10. When Caesar crossed his entire army over the Rhine, "he left a strong guard at each end of the bridge" (B.G. 4.18).

¹⁰Cf. FM 100-5, par. 853: "Cavalry units are employed initially on reconnaissance or security missions on the enemy's side of the river."

¹¹FM 100-5, par. 820.

Food and manner of living also elicit many a casual note from the great humanist's pen. His tribute to the inhabitants of Kent, his astonishment that the islanders live on milk and meat and clothe themselves in leather, his interest in Britains who dyed themselves blue with woad and in their long hair and shaving habits all provide equally good social lessons.

The Britains are described as agriculturists whose farm buildings are found very close together like those of Gaul. For money they use bronze or gold coins or, in lieu of coined money, tallies of iron of a certain standard of weight. Tin and iron are found, but bronze is imported. Hares, fowl and geese are kept only for pastime, for eating them is strictly forbidden.

What boy is not thrilled with the game of hide and seek that was successful solely because of the peculiar geographical features of the native land of the Veneti? These Veneti whose "prosperity depended on their carrying on with Britain trade of which they possessed a monopoly" taught Caesar not only that the narrow speedboats of the Roman would have to be replaced with the clumsier flat-bottomed boats with great sails of leather to cope safely with the strong tides, but that there were rules of trade and means of communication other than those commonly used by the Romans.

Of ranges and roads in Caesar there is no end. Perhaps his most striking route knowledge is that of the passages to Great Britain which he must have learned from the Morini, from whose country "erat brevissimus in Britanniam traiectus." Not only was this the shortest route but in Caesar's own word "commodissimum." When, on the occasion of his second invasion of Britain, he ordered his troops to sail from the "Itius Portus," Caesar made for the modern student an ideal lesson in geography. It is identified by some as Boulogne not only from the fact that the estuary there gave the only harbor on this coast in which 600 ships could have been built and docked but from the fact that four Roman roads are mentioned in the Itineraries as meeting at this point. Reading this passage and identifying the port with a class on the day after a commando raid give a geographical experience almost too poignant in its reality.

"Did the Romans really have no other means of measurement?" asks the curious student when he reads that the Hercynian forest's breadth was "nine days' journey for an unencumbered person." Here he introduces himself and his classmates to a fascinating study of ancient, primitive, popular, poetic, and perhaps even modern reckoning of distances. Throughout Caesar's digression on the Hercynian forest the imagination is piqued:

It begins in the borders of the Helvetii, Nemetes, Rauraci; and, following the direct line of the River Danube, it extends to the borders of the Daci and the Anartes; thence it turns leftward through districts away from the river and by reason of its size touches the borders of many

nations. There is no man in the Germany we know who can say that he has reached the limit of that forest, though he may have gone forward a sixty days' journey, or who has learned in what place it begins. It is known that many kinds of wild beasts not seen in any other place breed there. Of these the following are those that differ from the rest of the animal world and appear worthy of record.

The ox-shaped creature like a stag from whose forehead midway between the ears stands forth a single horn, taller and straighter than horns we know, competes for the interest of the young zoologist with elks that sleep standing against trees only to be trapped by men who leave severed trees standing to deceive these dappled goat-like creatures, and with ure-oxen characterized by great strength and speed, sparing nothing, man or beast, but snared in pits by Germans who, failing to domesticate the great creatures, encase in silver their horns to use as drinking cups.

References to the customs and enterprises of city, canton and clan are equally challenging. Though scholars may attack the authenticity of Caesar's ethnological statements, the student with his youthful interest in origins finds much satisfaction in such statements as "plerisque Belgas esse ortos ab Germanis Rhenumque antiquitus traductos propter loci fertilitatem ibi consedis Gallosque qui ea loca incoherent expulisse." Critical interest is kindled by reading the differences between indigenous inland tribes and the maritime regions' inhabitants who crossed over to plunder and ravage and then stayed to cultivate fields. Their names offer another lesson in social geography.

Racial characteristics Caesar draws with a few clear strokes. "Belgae fortissimi sunt" is the beginning of an excellent exercise in applied social science linked closely with geography. So is "Helvetii... Gallos reliquos praecedunt quod... cum Germanis contendunt." When he attributes the remarkable prowess of the Nervii to prohibition of luxuries ("vini reliquarumque rerum"), he starts us on an elementary lesson in sumptuary laws.

When circumstances warrant, in true sportsmanship Caesar compliments even his enemy. His compliments, for example, "a nation possessed of remarkable ingenuity and extremely apt to copy and carry out anything suggested," make material for another vivid kind of social geography lesson.

As for the stature of various peoples of his day, the Germans "ingenti magnitudine corporum, incredibili virtute atque exercitatione in armis" upon whose features and frightening eyes the Roman troops could not even look, and the Gauls, who were tall, as a rule, and despised the short stature of the Romans, are best discussed by Caesar.

Ship building and shipping played a prominent part in the life of both Gaul and Britain. The trader's status seems to be variable, but is decidedly worth comparative study. In some communities, the trader was allowed to

enter only because he was the means of disposing of numerous spoils of war; from others he was debarred because he brought in the ruinous fire-water; in still others he was the importer of those high Gallic standards that were responsible for developing a higher stage of civilization among lesser tribes like the Ubii.

As for the government, the Suebi, by far the most warlike of the Germans, maintained one of the earliest communistic or socialistic communities on record, a community characterized by the annual rotation of

agricultural and military duties for a sturdy, stalwart populace inured to great hardships and strenuous living through daily practice of privation.

These integrated experiences in social science and geography so well supplement practice in military history that the study of Caesar finds a new value as an introduction to today's greatest need, intelligent understanding of remote peoples.

JUANITA M. DOWNES

CHELTENHAM TOWNSHIP HIGH SCHOOL, PHILADELPHIA

REVIEWS

Catalogus Codicum Graecorum et Latinorum Bibliothecae Gotoburgensis. By TÖNNES KLEBERG. v, 48 pages, 6 figures on plates. Elander, Göteborg 1941

This catalogue of Greek and Latin texts in the library of Göteborg represents 34 manuscripts, of which four are Greek and the remaining thirty are Latin.

In his preface Dr. Kleberg pays tribute to Vilhelm Ljunstrom, for many years a teacher of Latin in the Göteborg Academy, as well as to several others who aided him in arranging this catalogue. Each of the texts has been most minutely examined by Dr. Kleberg and his colleagues as to the period from which the manuscript dates, its format, viz. the number of columns it contains, the number of lines to a column, the pictures, if any, their color, and the type of script. Mention is made of any leaves mutilated or missing. A description of the cover of each text follows, names of owners, whence the text came, and, finally, the literature on the text.

The three Greek authors whose works are in the library in manuscript are Dionysius Periegetes, Paul the Apostle, Menologius Metaphastis, besides several books of the New Testament, e.g. the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistle of St. James, the First Epistle of St. Peter, the Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians and his Epistle to the Colossians. Among the Latin authors are Terence, Vergil, Statius, Justinus, several commentators on Aristotle's works, Gregory the Great, Cato, Cassiodorus, Lactantius, Seneca, Peter the Lombard, and Sallust.

One of the particularly interesting Latin texts is that of the Epistles of Phalaris; interesting because his name, affixed to 148 Greek letters, represents him as a patron of art and poetry. Richard Bentley, considered England's greatest philologist and generally considered to have established the principle of historical criticism, attained an immediate reputation throughout Europe in 1699 when he conclusively proved these epistles a forgery, not the work of the infamous tyrant of Agrigento notorious for cruelty.

The compilation of this catalogue has been a careful, painstaking work on the part of the scholars represented and must have consumed a considerable time. The catalogue should be valuable to students interested in any of the texts contained in it.

SISTER MARY BORROMEO DUNN

COLLEGE MISERICORDIA

Three Greek Tragedies in Translation. By DAVID GRENE. ix, 228 pages. University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1942 \$2.50

Books dealing with Greek tragedy are particularly apt to be the work of ill-prepared enthusiasts or unimaginative pedants. Here is a book done with both enthusiasm and scholarship, by an author whose admiration for his subject is neither uncritical nor fortified by ignorance of other dramatic forms nor indifferent to the demands of exact scholarship. Greek tragedy does not emerge, as it does in so many books written in the present century, as a corpus vile for studying primitive origins, nor as a tract for conveying social and religious doctrine, nor, on the other hand, as a rootless outpouring of poetic impulses with no significance other than the expression of pure art.

Mr. Grene's book contains a General Introduction of 17 pages, and translations of Prometheus, Oedipus the King, and Hippolytus, with separate introductions of 18, 9, and 13 pages. The General Introduction is admirable; I know of no treatment in similar compass as adequate. The second paragraph is an excellent one-page exposition of the nature of tragedy. Subsequent sections deal with the chorus, the verse form, and the myth-plots. The emphasis is on the significance of the form rather than on the spiritual implications of the subject matter. One might desiderate a fuller appreciation of the plays as *lyrical* dramas. This is one of the principal emphases in H. D. F. Kitto's recent Greek Tragedy (reviewed by Mr. Grene in The New Republic for September 9, 1940). Determination of spiritual implications is more subjective and has varied greatly among different students and in different ages, and so may justly be omitted in a factual guide. Yet "people who care to find out what a Greek tragedy is like" (Preface)

might well be given more guidance to the characteristic outlooks and points of view of Greek tragedy, since only three specimen plays are provided.

From the point of view of the intended readers' requirements the individual introductions may be more sharply criticized. Two of them appeared originally in Classical Philology, and the sights seem to be raised for a specialist audience rather than for interested amateurs. Contributions to Classical Philology are hardly more likely to be suitable for inclusion in beginners' handbooks than chapters in beginners' handbooks are likely to be suitable for the columns of Classical Philology. For the purposes of such a book as this, short guides to the various plays like those in Gilbert Norwood's Greek Tragedy (though not necessarily with the same emphases) would seem to be ideal. The special contribution of the Prometheus introduction is the explanation of the different levels of the play's symbolism, Prometheus being at once the symbol of the rebel against the tyrant, of knowledge against force, and the champion of man as opposed to god. In the Oedipus introduction Mr. Grene deprecates the usual description of the play as a tragedy of destiny and suggests that it may rather be described as a psychological mystery story. That is an interesting point of view, but surely the conflict between a reasonably good man and destiny is what makes the play a tragedy, and however trite the thought may be to an experienced student a new reader is entitled to receive orthodox direction. As a matter of fact Mr. Grene must himself say (85), "The play, then, the more we study it, becomes a picture of the complexity and chaos of life itself, strangely overridden by a compelling direction of events." The originality of Mr. Grene's approach is most clearly apparent in the Hippolytus introduction. Traditional criticism agrees that the play is a symbolic conflict between the ideal of austere chastity and the natural desires of the flesh, and that Hippolytus is the central figure and Phaedra merely a foil. Mr. Grene argues that Phaedra and her tragedy constitute the central interest. "It is a play about the unchallengeable rule of love over the human animal and about the transformation which love can make in the human animal" (165). This is a substantial contribution to the understanding of the play; I could only wish it sounded less like a contentious philologist.

But the translations are the main thing in the book, and Mr. Grene's versions must be pronounced admirable. Simple prose is a betrayal of the high formalism of Greek tragedy, and any formal English verse is bound to be too stiff for the relaxed passages. Mr. Grene has hit on a happy compromise in an extremely loose verse, distinguished from prose by cadence and the printer's style rather than by diction and inversions. Dignity is combined with freshness. Individual lines, frequently presenting the imagery of the Greek unaltered, are

strikingly good, and effectiveness is never sought at the expense of the Greek. An inevitable handicap in presenting plays of three different authors in a single volume by a single translator using a single form is that all three are apt to sound too much of a piece. But because these versions stick firmly to the Greek the fault is not as great as it is in omnibus volumes of Gilbert Murray's translations where Aristophanes joins the tragic three in identical Swinburnian flutings, or for that matter, as in the versions of the Bible where translators and binders impose an unreal uniformity.

It is always amusing to see how each man's approach to a foreign author is colored by his own predispositions, and it is not difficult to guess that Mr. Grene's sympathies are Irish. Not only do Yeats and Synge and Irish heroic legends and even Mr. Bloom appear in the Introduction, but within fifty lines of the end of the Prometheus we find such lines as these:

Look, here is Zeus' footman,
this fetch-and-carry messenger of him,
the New King.
Your words declare you mad, and mad indeed. . . .
and are you not
a child, and sillier than a child, to think
that I should tell you anything?

There are leprechauns hiding in the triglyphs.

MOSES HADAS

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

The Religion of Greece in Prehistoric Times.

By AXEL W. PERSSON. (ix,) 189 pages, 29 figures on plates, 29 figures in text. University of California Press, Berkeley & Los Angeles 1942 (Sather Classical Lectures, Volume 17) \$2

The study of the religion of prehistoric Greece is hampered by the fact that no literary documents are available, so that all conclusions depend on the interpretation of monuments. Such interpretation can never attain certainty, but probability only. This lack of evidence can be compensated, at least partially, by comparison with the religions of the Near East. That prehistoric Greece was related to the more advanced Eastern cultures and influenced by them becomes ever more certain as our knowledge of the East increases from year to year. We might mention one case, namely the discovery of the double axe in the Tell Halaf period of Upper Mesopotamia which solves the much discussed problem of its origin in favor of Asia (Iraq 2.95). A number of scholars have taken this approach and have found parallels between Minoan and particularly Anatolian religion. Persson falls in line with them. He points out the great rôle which fertility rites play in the religion of early man, especially after the creating of agriculture. We know a great deal about this religion which grew out of the cycle of vegetation throughout the year from Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, Syria and

Egypt. There is regional differentiation; the names and festivals vary; we find Cybele and Attis, Ishtar and Tammuz, Aphrodite and Adonis, Isis and Osiris, but the basic idea is the same. The documents of Ras Shamra and studies to which must be added Frankfort's illuminating article on the Sumerian fertility god (Iraq 1.5ff.) have shown the antiquity of this religion.

Persson's new and brilliant idea is to see whether representations of such a cycle of vegetation rites can be found in Greece. He selects twenty-eight rings with cult scenes and interprets them as showing a consistent idea developing in the following sequence: (1) winter: death of nature and man, represented by denuded trees and ritual obsequies; mankind is mourning and imploring the divine powers which are responding; (2) spring: the leaves are budding and flowers cover the ground; dancing maidens and men accompanied by animals pay homage to the gods; festivals are celebrated; (3) summer: the sun shines in all its strength and the trees have full foliage; fruits are plucked and flowers are presented to the goddess in her sanctuary and a first offering of wine is made; (4) autumn: the goddess leaves her sanctuaries and crosses the sea by boat. The acting deities are a goddess and a young god; the goddess is of superior rank, as is clearly shown on a ring from Mycenae. It is true that the parallelism with the Eastern religions is not absolute, but we must expect regional peculiarities; furthermore some of the links are very tenuous, such as the connection of the bull games with the spring festival; finally certainty cannot be reached without literary evidence, as was said before. Nevertheless, the reviewer is inclined to regard Persson's idea as perfectly possible and to recommend it as a working hypothesis.

A wealth of ideas is found in the interpretation of single motives, a number of which are convincing, whereas others seem doubtful. We can mention a very few only: the shield is the symbol of divine protection and the knot indicates that the object to which it is appended is 'connected with' the divinity; the mirror in the hand of the goddess is used for sun magic; the interpretation of three men in female dress as eunuchs and of three women with a peculiar rendering of the upper body as Amazons is highly conjectural. The Amazons are declared to be female equivalents to the eunuchs who cut off one or both breasts and dedicated them to the goddess as a fertility rite. Some representations of Cybele (Röm. Mitt. 1919, 83) might corroborate this view; they show the breasts not belonging to her body, but put on a cloth as attached attributes.

Besides this main thesis the survival of Minoan-Mycenaean religion into the classical period is discussed. The first chapter deals with the myth of Glaucus in which several preclassical motives can be recognized, especially the burying in honey. It can be added that the life-giving plant brought by a snake has an analogy

in Mesopotamian religion where the plant of immortality obtained by Gilgamesh to resurrect his friend Engidu is eaten by a snake. In another chapter Persson explains the names of some Greek mythological figures as 'epicleseis' by which the Greeks invoked the Great Minoan goddess who thus split into a number of persons. Such multiplication fits very well into the historical development in which the unified Minoan and later Mycenaean empires were followed by a great number of independent states. He interprets Ariadne as 'the very holy'; Britomartis as 'thou sweet virgin'; Dictynna as 'thou who dwellest on Dicte'; Aphaia as perhaps 'the unseen'; Pasiphae as 'the all illuminating'; Europa as 'the wide or dark glancing'; Glaucus as 'the gray-blue one.' Likewise discussed are Hyacinthus, Rhea, Artemis Ephesia, Aphrodite and Demeter. Regarding Artemis it can be objected that, if Minoan and Anatolian religion are related, the assumption of Minoan influence in Ephesus is unnecessary, because the native Anatolian religion explains the analogies.

Concerning Demeter and Eleusis, the difference between Minoan and Mycenaean religion should be taken into consideration, a fact which is mentioned by Persson himself. Since the mainland was settled from Anatolia but not via Crete, we must expect analogous, but not identical beliefs. The leading pair is indeed not goddess and lover, but mother and daughter, namely Demeter and Persephone. The earliest building at Eleusis is Mycenaean, not Minoan (Mylonas, Wash. Univ. Stud. N.S. Language and Literature Nr. 13 [1942] 19ff.). Furthermore, we have archaeological material from both periods, the Mycenaean and the classical, and this material proves that a profound transformation took place between the two. The possibility of such transformation should also be considered in the literary and the religious fields in which we have material from the classical period only. Eleusis is a good test: the cult persisted, but the building of geometric times is curvilinear and thus totally different from the "megaron" of Mycenaean times (cf. Metr. Mus. Stud. 5 [1936] 166, footnote). We can also deduce a transformation of the cult from the architecture. The Mycenaean cult took place in the open, as the platform and the free space in front shows; but both these are missing in geometric times so that the *δρόμια* must have been performed inside the telesterium and *ἐν σκότειν* as in later times. The 'mysteries' are thus post-mycenaean (cf. a passage in Diodorus quoted by Persson, 118). It must also be borne in mind that figures like Ariadne and others of the group play a very minor part in classical times. Archaeology too shows the scarcity of Minoan survivals. In the last chapter Persson interprets some Swedish rock carvings as showing similar fertility rites.

VALENTINE MÜLLER

BYRN MAWR COLLEGE

ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES

This department is conducted by Dr. Charles T. Murphy of Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey. Correspondence concerning abstracts may be addressed to him.

EPIGRAPHY. NUMISMATICS. PAPHYROLOGY

PEARCE, BERTRAM W. *The coins from Richborough—A survey.* A review of numismatic results of excavations at Richborough with a brief summary of the 57,487 coins found from 1922 to the present, of the fifteen hoards discovered, and comment on interesting individual pieces. The discovery of two silver coins of Carausius in mint condition with mint-mark RSR raises the question whether its mark is that of a Richborough mint. Further evidence must be forthcoming to support any such claim.
NC 20 (1940) 57-75 (Mosser)

PEARCE, J. W. E. *Barbarous overstrikes found in Fourth-Century hoards: Some additional evidence from the East.* Two coins from an eastern hoard have been overstruck with the "spearing falling horseman" type over the "two captives" type of the "Fel. temp. reparatio" series. The overstrikes have eastern mint-marks. As the earlier type is a gramme lighter in weight than the later, the overstriking bears evidence of some currency reform and an attempt to bring a superseded coin into currency again.
NC 20 (1940) 162-3 (Mosser)

— *Issues of the Solidi "VICTORIA AVGG" from Treviri.* A chronological arrangement of Roman gold issues from the mint of Treviri from 367 to 392 A.D. Ill.
NC 20 (1940) 138-61 (Mosser)

SAXL, F. *The Classical Inscription in Renaissance Art and Politics: Bartholomaeus Fontius, Liber monumentorum Romanae urbis et aliorum locorum.* Some aspects of the live interest in epigraphical studies among Renaissance scholars, with particular attention to a fragmentary manuscript by Bartholomaeus Fontius (1445-1513), now in the possession of Bernard Ashmole of London. Description of the manuscript and catalogue of its inscriptional contents, many of them not found in CIL or CIG. Ill.

Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld
Institutes 4 (1940-41) 19-46 (Spaeth)

SYDENHAM, E. A. *The date of Piso-Caepio.* Grueber (B.M.C. Coins of Rom. Rep. i 170n) dated the well known denarii of Piso and Caepio to 100 B.C. on the basis of their inscription AD. FRV. EMV referring to the passage of the lex frumentaria of Saturninus in that year. It is by no means certain that the coins commemorate the passage of the law of Saturninus, for it is scarcely likely that Q. Servilius Caepio, the violent opposer of the law, was the moneyer to strike coins in its commemoration. A more serious objection to the traditional date comes from the position of the coins in recorded finds. Examination of the evidence brings the coinage to a later date of 96-95, a date which makes arrangement of the earlier and later issues more intelligible. As the names Piso and Caepio are simply cognomina, it seems likely that they are not signatures of moneyers but rather names put on a commemorative issue celebrating them as advocates of "fair-price" corn and not of the extra-cheap corn proposed by Saturninus. Ill.

NC 20 (1940) 164-78 (Mosser)

THOMPSON, MARGARET. *Coins for the Eleusinia.* The "group of <Attic bronze> coins stamped with representations of the Eleusinian divinities or their attributes and inscribed ΕΑΕΥΣΙ or ΑΘΕ" were probably minted in Athens to mark the celebration of the quadrennial Greater Eleusinia. They are stamped ΑΘΕ in years when the celebration was confined to Athens because Eleusis was in enemy hands. These theories, if correct, aid in dating the coins. Ill.
Hesperia 11 (1942) 213-29 (Durham)

WHITEHEAD, R. B. *Notes on the Indo-Greeks.* Publication of 17 new or interesting types of Indo-Greek coins on the basis of which re-statement or correction is made of Tarn's conclusions in his *The Greeks in Bactria and India*. Ill.
NC 20 (1940) 89-122 (Mosser)

LITERARY HISTORY. CRITICISM

HAMMER, JACOB. *Some Additional Manuscripts of Geoffrey of Monmouth's Historia Regum Britanniae.* Description of twelve manuscripts (two from Spain, one from Switzerland, one from Germany, eight from England) supplementing the list compiled by A. Griscom in his edition (1929) of the *Historia*.
Modern Language Quarterly 3 (1942) 235-42 (Spaeth)

KUHN, HELMUT. *The True Tragedy: On the Relationship between Greek Tragedy and Plato.* I. The causal link between tragedy and Platonic philosophy is largely but not solely a relation of thesis and anti-thesis. There is also a gradual trend, observable in Aeschylus, to question the idea of Fate and that of the envy or jealousy of the gods, which brings tragic poetry close to the Platonic scheme of thought.
HSCPh 52 (1941) 1-40 (Charney)

LAISTNER, M. L. W. *Richard Bentley: 1742-1942.* An apologetic for Bentley's scholarly attitudes and achievements, with particular attention to the work on Horace.
SPHNC 39 (1942) 510-23 (Spaeth)

NISSEN, THEODOR. *Historisches Epos und Panegyrikos in der Spätantike.* The *Expositio Persica* is not an historical epic, but in plan and compass it is a panegyric like the two other profane poems of Georgius. However, epic bits are incorporated in it in ever increasing extent, and this fact seems to qualify the distinction drawn by Wilamowitz that an epic tells only a narrative, which may however glorify a living person, whereas a panegyric must also narrate the great deeds of the person celebrated. The same qualification applies to the writings of Corippus and Claudian, and therein we can see the influence of the ancient rhetorical tradition.
H 75 (1940) 298-325 (Kirk)

WATSON, SARA R. *Milton's Ideal Day: Its Development as a Pastoral Theme.* A demonstration that "the description of the ideal day is a significant and deeply rooted theme which developed gradually during the whole course of the pastoral tradition." Milton's *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso* are concerned with this well established tradition, and "their form or organization first received full expression by Virgil."
PMLA 57 (1942) 404-20 (Spaeth)

WEINBERG, BERNARD. *Scaliger versus Aristotle on Poetics.* Reasons for J. C. Scaliger's disagreements with Aristotle's *Poetics* on certain fundamentals of poetic theory, with particular attention to the definition of tragedy, the qualitative parts of tragedy, the end of poetry, and the relative importance of plot and character.
Modern Philology 39 (1942) 337-60 (Spaeth)